

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2004

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FILING DATE APPLICATION NO. 4525 04/30/2001 Thomas Winkler NC29346 09/846,073 EXAMINER 30973 7590 03/11/2004 SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P. LE, NHAN T 5956 SHERRY LANE PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT **SUITE 1400** DALLAS, TX 75225 2685

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/846,073	WINKLER, THOMAS
	Examiner	Art Unit
TL MAILING DATE - SALi-	Nhan T Le	2685
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		
Status		
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04/30/01</u>. This action is FINAL. This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 		
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the liderawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea. * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8</u>. 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	

Application/Control Number: 09/846,073

Art Unit: 2685

ETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. <u>Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14-17, 19, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)</u> as being unpatentable over Rydbeck (US 5,590,417) in view of Grube et al (US 5,590,417).

As to claims 1, 11, Rydbeck teaches a communications system, a system for extending the range of a wireless headset comprising: a phone (see fig. 2c, number 120, col. 2, line 56- col. 3, line 2); a wireless headset associated with the phone, the wireless headset capable of communicating directly with the phone utilizing a wireless communications protocol having a distance limit (see fig. 2c, number 10, col. 2, line 56-col. 3, line 2);

Rydbeck fails to teach a communications system; and a plurality of access points each coupled to the communications system at one of a plurality of dispersed locations, wherein the access points are capable of selectively establishing a communications path within the communications system between an access point emulating the phone and an access point emulating the headset to provide communications between the phone and the headset when the phone and the headset are separated by a distance greater than the distance limit. Grube teaches the communications system (see fig. 1,

Control Number: 05/040,07

, we of the 2000

number 101, col. 2, lines 31-43); and a plurality of access points (see fig. 1, numbers

Page 3

106-109; 110-112; communication resource) each coupled to the communications

system at one of a plurality of dispersed locations, wherein the access points are

capable of selectively establishing a communications path within the communications

system between an access point emulating a communication unit and an access point

emulating another communication unit to provide communications between the

communication units when the communication units are separated by a distance greater

than the distance limit (see col. 2, lines 44-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching

of Grube into the system of Rydbeck in order to maintain the wide range communication

link between the devices.

As to claims 2, 12, it is clear that as Rydbeck is modified with Grube, the above combination teaches the system of claim 1, wherein each access point is capable of selectively: emulating the phone utilizing the communications protocol; emulating the headset utilizing the communications protocol communicating with the phone within the finite distance from the phone utilizing the communications protocol, communicating with the headset within the finite distance from the headset utilizing the communications protocol, and interfacing with the communications system.

As to claims 4, 14, as the combination of Rydbeck and Grube is made, it teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the phone and the headset are separated by a distance greater than the distance limit, but the phone is separated from a first access point by a distance not greater than the distance limit and the headset is separated from a second

Application/Control Number: 09/846,073

Art Unit: 2685

access point by a distance not greater than the distance limit (see col. 2, lines 44-67, col. 3, lines 1-52).

As to claims 5, 15, the combination of Rydbeck and Grube teaches the system of claim 4 wherein the first access point emulates the headset in communicating with the phone and the second access point emulates the phone in communicating with the headset (see col. 2, lines 44-67. col. 3, lines 1-52).

As to claims 6, 16, the combination of Rydbeck and Grube teaches the system of claim 5 wherein the communications path within the communications system couples the first and second access points (see col. 2, lines 44-67, col. 3, lines 1-52).

As to claims 7, 17, the combination of Rydbeck and Grube teaches the system of claim 6 wherein communications from the phone received at the first access point are forwarded via the communications path to the second access point for transmission to the headset and communications from the headset received at the second access point are forwarded via the communications path to the first access point for transmission to the phone (see fig. 1, numbers 106-109; 110-112, col. 2, lines 44-67, col. 3, lines 1-52).

As to claims 9, 19, the combination of Rydbeck and Grube teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the phone and the headset communicate directly when the phone and the headset are separated by a distance not greater than the distance limit and communicate via the communications path between two access points when the phone and the headset are separated by a distance greater than the distance limit (see fig. 1, numbers 106-109; 110-112, col. 2, lines 44-67, col. 3, lines 1-52).

Application/Control Number: 09/846,073 Page 5

Art Unit: 2685

As to claims 10, 20, the combination of Rydbeck and Grube teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the access points are capable of detecting when the phone and the headset are separated by a distance greater than the distance limit or whether the phone and the headset are communicating directly (see col. 2, lines 44-67, col. 3, lines 1-52).

2. <u>Claims 3, 8, 13, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable</u> over Rydbeck (US 5,590,417) in view of Grube et al (US 5,590,417) and in further view of Cannon (US 6,650,871).

As to claims 3, 13, the combination of Rydbeck and Grube fails to teach the system of claim 2 wherein the phone and the headset communicate utilizing Bluetooth and the access points are each capable of emulating the phone and the heads utilizing Bluetooth. Cannon teach the communication between various electronic devices using Bluetooth protocol (see col.3, lines 39-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Cannon into the system of Rydbeck and Grube in order to allow the communication between multiple electronic devices with accommodation for larger area coverage (see col. 1, lines 18-25, as suggested by Cannon).

As to claims 8, 18, the combination of Rydbeck, Grube, and Cannon further teaches the system of claim 4 wherein the distance limit is a Bluetooth wireless, headset distance limit (see Cannon, col. 7, lines 5-14).

Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 09/846,073

Art Unit: 2685

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Page 6

Shoobridge (US 6,326,926) teaches method of operating a wireless and a short

range wireless connection in the same frequency.

Singhal (US 6,633,761) teaches enabling seamless user and mobility in a short

range wireless network environment.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Nhan T Le whose telephone number is 703-305-4538.

The examiner can normally be reached on 08:00-05:00 (Mon-Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Edward Urban can be reached on 703-305-4385. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nhan Le

NGUYEN T. VO PRIMARY EXAMINER

Mayer Vo